



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE HOMERIC AUGMENT AGAIN¹

In *CP*, VII, 397 ff. I took certain objections to the statistics and procedure by which Mr. J. J. Drewitt essayed (*CQ*, VI, 44 ff. and 104 ff.) to establish a new theory of the Homeric augment. In *CP*, VIII, 349 ff. he exhibits more statistics and more arguments, and does so with extraordinary assurance. They are, however, even poorer than his original collection. I take his matter as it comes, and, for brevity's sake, presuppose on the part of my readers some knowledge of his and my previous papers.

First, Mr. Drewitt resuscitates "type ἀκονσε." He asks why there is not a single instance of it in the similes. No one can say, but no one need wonder. To those who have not time to delve for themselves, the question is presented as something formidable. Those who know that the similes occupy less than 1,000 of the 28,000 lines in the poems; that the aorists in them do not number 150, that only 40 of these are cases for the temporal augment, and that these 40 are from only 23 different verbs, will smile as they regard this limited scope for the type. Let that suffice for the present. Nor is the case to be helped by a list of words and combinations of the value — ∪ ∪. Such are to be found, of course. Homer could no doubt have avoided them had he pleased; the point is that he could not do so as easily as he could avoid "type ἤκουσε," where he had only to drop the augment to get the form ∪ — ∪ which we know he liked better.

But Mr. Drewitt, "so careful of the type," clutches at other straws. The "offensive type ἤκουσε" is "much commoner in the narrative of the *Odyssey*"—the poem of the late age in which "speech" had come in and the epic was no longer, as Mr. Drewitt would have us believe it once was, "limited to narrative and similes." The figures are, *Il.** 22, *Od.* 20,² or, allowing for the smaller area of narrative in the *Odyssey*, say 22:30. An enormous difference! But what we want, of course, is not occurrences, but separate aorists. Fifteen of the 20 occurrences in the *Odyssey* are of only 3 aorists—ἵκοντο, ὤϊξε(αν), and ἡγέρθη! Is it necessary to say more? The case is to be supported by statistics of "spondaic datives in -εσσι," which "go up by leaps and bounds in the *Odyssey*." They are sure to be an interesting study to anyone who has the time for it. Let no man be satisfied with the mere brute totals.³

¹ I regret the delay in the appearance of this reply, but I did not see Mr. Drewitt's note till a summary in the *BPW* of November 22 last drew my attention to it.

² By *Il.** I mean the *Iliad* shorn by Mr. Drewitt of 494—end, Θ, I, K, Ψ, and Ω.

³ Since this was written I have tabulated these datives for myself, and am more than ever anxious to see the proof.

On a second point, syllabics +δέ, Mr. Drewitt assumes a tone of mingled patronage and banter which, in view of the result, will be seen to be really ludicrous. On my explanation of the rarity of the type ἔθηκε δέ after the 3d trochee, the lofty comment is, "very good indeed; *τρίδραχμὸν γε θοῦρμήνευμα*." And then comes the crushing retort, if ἔθηκε δέ be so rare "why is type *ἔγειρε δέ* so startlingly actual?" Mr. Drewitt can produce "no less than" 10 instances from *Iliad** (narrative)—10 instances, mind you, in 6,650 lines. They swarm! But let us accept them with due respect. He has not observed, or does not trouble to mention, a certain difference that is patent between the two sets of occurrences. Every one of his 10 is of a *verb commencing with a vowel*, and that is the explanation of this (to quote his elegant *ipsissima verba*) "trifle" which "Mr. Shewan and the ungrateful Homer" are to "settle between themselves." Homer does not absolutely reject an amphibrach after the 3d trochee. I showed before that there are 304 such cases in the poems, that in 154 of them the form is followed by δέ, and that in 91 of these latter the word is a verb. Homer must often have wanted to put an aorist 3d pers. indic. in that particular place, but the 4th trochee gave him pause. What did the ingrate do? If the aorist was syllabic, he generally let it go; he could use the verb, augmented or not, elsewhere. But if it was one of Mr. Drewitt's verbs, *ἐγείρω*, *ἀμύνω*, etc., he had either to use it unaugmented or use it augmented elsewhere in the verse. But, if he adopted the latter alternative, he imposed on himself the form — — — which we know from statistics he did not like so well. Is it then strange that we find more cases of "type *ἔγειρε δέ*" than of "type *ἔθηκε δέ*"? Is the "puzzle" Mr. Drewitt propounds *τρίδραχμον*? Is it worth a wretched *ἡμωβόλιον*? Rather, *εἰς κόρακας θοῦρμήνευμα*.

But he goes farther—and fares even worse. *Quem deus*—but the saying is "somewhat musty." I had shown the weakness of his statistics of syllabics +δέ by pointing out, *what he had passed over in silence*, that the mass of them, only a "trifle" (as he would say) of two-thirds of them, were initial in the line. "Very good" is his remark again (this time without a money value), and he goes on to ask why the syllabic +δέ is "so relatively rare in *Iliad**." Here he is, as Mark Twain once put it, riven by a perfect thunderbolt of wit. To quote the exact words of the flippancy, "let us," he says, "just for fun" (the "fun" of course being meant to be "death to us"), "take a peep at ι, κ, λ, μ." In these books there are 14 augmented aorists starting the verse, and no fewer than 10 are followed by δέ. The degeneration from *Iliad**, with only 160 out of 300, is obvious! But again a relevant consideration, which he is aware of, for I pointed it out to him before, is passed over *sub silentio*. These 10 instances are reducible to three types, *ἐκλύσθη δέ* (twice), *ἔστην(αν) δέ* (4 times in 200 lines of κ), and *ἔγνω(σαν) δέ* (3 times in λ and once in κ). Homer has occasion—due to his subject; a consideration which Mr. Drewitt studiously ignores—to use three formulae frequently, and *more suo* does so. The proper way of presenting the figures is, 7

instances, 3 of them with δέ. When Mr. Drewitt makes a fresh comparison bearing this point in mind, it will be time to answer him. He should be more careful how he invites peeps, even "for fun," and beware how he audaciously charges Homer with being "so thoughtless in distributing his examples." It is not Homer who nods, but his critic who misrepresents him.

And so on. Is it necessary to go farther and to waste more time? Certainly not. I exposed the futility of Mr. Drewitt's statistics and of his deductions from them in my first paper, and here they are again more futile than ever. And his method is unchanged. He still assumes "shifts," still "clings despairingly" to the similes and the νῦν cases, still declines to see the vital distinction which I pointed out to him between the two kinds of "speech." He ends by suggesting that Unitarians should ignore statistics. He would be well advised himself to give them up. He generally fails to see their real significance.

A. SHEWAN

ST. ANDREWS
November 30, 1913

NOTE ON ARISTOTLE'S *DE ANIMA* 403a 23

ἔτι δὲ τοῦτο μᾶλλον φανερόν · μηθενὸς γὰρ φοβεροῦ συμβαίνοντος ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι γίνονται τοῖς τοῦ φοβουμένου.

After ἔτι δέ the preposition διά has probably fallen out by haplography. Hicks lxxvii gives many examples of the tendency of E to omit small words, and διά would be hardly distinguishable from δέ. Its reinstatement here restores, I think, a much-vexed passage, which Torstrick's τοῦτου μᾶλλον and Christ's τούτῳ μᾶλλον do not cure, though the latter points the way.

Aristotle has given one proof of the interdependence of mind and body. He introduces a still stronger confirmation with the words: ἔτι δὲ <διά> τοῦτο μᾶλλον φανερόν. Cf. Themistius, περὶ ὕπνου, p. 257, 5, Spengel, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶνδε δῆλον. φῖ γὰρ, etc. The forward reference of τοῦτο of course presents no difficulty. Cf. *Gen. An.* 747b 28, λέγω δὲ λογικὴν διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι, etc. The γὰρ of the clause μηθενὸς γὰρ φοβεροῦ is explicative of διὰ τοῦτο. It is the analogue in an argument of the so-called narrative γὰρ. The editions seem to me for the most part to blink the difficulty. Hicks, retaining the vulgate, apparently translates as if he had my text: "Still more is this evident from the fact that," etc.

PAUL SHOREY

THE BACKGROUND OF THE *LEX MANILIA*

Cicero's *Pro lege Manilia* frankly says that the Roman *equites*, the middle-class nobility of wealth, were deeply interested in placing Pompey in command of the war against Mithridates. This interest, Cicero implies, was